ResearchGate

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305709496

Germanic languages and areal linguistics

Chapter · January 2017

DOI: 10.1017/9781107279872.010

CITATION
1

READS
3,237

2 authors:

Johan van der Auwera
University of Antwerp
201 PUBLICATIONS **2,460** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

Daniel Van Olmen
Lancaster University
52 PUBLICATIONS **190** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Impersonalisation in Afrikaans and other West Germanic Languages View project

Impersonal pronouns: Typological and contrastive investigations View project

All content following this page was uploaded by Daniel Van Olmen on 29 July 2016.

The user has requested enhancement of the downloaded file.

The Germanic languages and areal linguistics[1] **Draft April 2013**

Johan van der Auwera (University of Antwerp)
& Daniël Van Olmen (Lancaster University)

1. Introduction

The Germanic languages will have been 'areal' since prehistoric times. When Germanic split off from Indo-European, it was probably in part due to contact with non-Indo-European languages. And if we time travel directly to the present, the most successful Germanic language, with success defined in terms of global societal relevance and the number of first or second language speakers, i.e. English, is also very 'areal'. For one thing, English is very Romance, arguably also very Celtic and, though it is a West Germanic language, it also very North Germanic. And for another thing, due to its worldwide geographical spread, English is now giving rise to a large number of contact varieties. English is indeed areally unique, but the stories of the other Germanic languages have important areal dimensions, too, with e.g. Low German shaping Continental North Germanic, Danish splitting up Norwegian or Dutch giving way to Afrikaans. The current chapter sketches the research and issues in the areal linguistics of the Germanic languages. In section 2, some general notions are introduced. Section 3 deals with areality within Germanic, section 4 with areality involving Germanic and non-Germanic. Section 5 is the conclusion.

Note that this chapter overlaps with several other chapters, viz. Chapter XX – An areal view of Europe, Chapter XX – The British Isles, Chapter XX – Varieties of English, Chapter XX – South Africa and Chapter XX – Creoles). The volume-wide presence of English is partially a result of the areal success of the language, but not entirely. English is clearly the best studied language in the world but that does not mean that its areal linguistics was attended to sufficiently. In fact, for a long time, it was not. But recent years have seen a drastic change (e.g. Miller 2012, Hickey (ed.) 2012, and Schreier & Hundt 2013). Though this chapter cannot focus on English, the language cannot be absent either, for we may not always agree with our fellow linguists. We will also take special care to compare the areal linguistics of English to that of the other Germanic languages.

2. Concepts, dimensions and restrictions

To describe the dimensions of contact change, various terms and concepts are at our disposal. The first is 'areality'. We use the term in a rather strict but also standard way, i.e. to refer to similarities between languages used in the same or an adjacent geographical area which are due not (only) to chance, universal formal/functional tendencies or genetic affiliation but (at least partially) to contact. The more and the deeper the languages resemble each other, the more the similarity concerns grammar rather than lexicon. The more the similarities are typologically unusual and the more languages the contact involves, the more interesting the phenomena are

[1] Thanks are due to Markku Filppula (University of Eastern Finland), Hartmut Haberland (Roskilde University) and Axel Holvoet (Universities of Vilnius and Warsaw).

and the more linguists have been inclined to refer to the languages as a *Sprachbund* (Trubetzkoy 1930) or – the standard rendering in English – 'linguistic area'.[2] Of the linguistic areas discussed in the current literature, three are relevant for Germanic, viz. 'Standard Average European' (van der Auwera 1998b, 2011; Haspelmath 1998, 2001, Heine & Kuteva 2006, see also Chapter XX), 'Circum-Baltic' (Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001, Wälchli 2011)[3], and 'British Isles' (Tristam 1999, Filppula, Klemola & Paulasto 2008, see also Chapter XX).[4] These areas are old and the first two are very large, loose and multi-causal. In what follows we will refer to these linguistic areas, but the areality of Germanic languages is by no means confined to these or to the periods in which they arose. Areality is also found in Germanic linguistic enclaves (*Sprachinseln*), i.e., relatively small areas in which a Germanic vernacular – (?nearly) always a non-standard variety – is surrounded by other languages, or in border areas, in which a Germanic language – again (?nearly) always a non-standard variety– is adjacent to another language.[5] For both situations it would be justified to bring in a notion of 'linguistic area', but it is not clear how much that would advance our knowledge (cp. Matras 2009: 265-277). Note that these two situations feature non-standard languages and it is increasingly stressed that areality studies should indeed focus on such varieties (e.g. Wälchli 2011: 339, Murelli & Kortmann 2011). This is not in conflict with the fact that the current chapter often discusses the standard varieties, the reason being that their areal properties arose in the period before they were standardized.

Second, the traditional notions of 'superstrate', 'substrate' and 'adstrate' (coming from Romance linguistics, Kontzi 1982: 4, 9-10) remain useful. They reflect differences of prestige, with 'super' going with more prestige, 'sub' with less prestige and 'ad' with equal prestige. The distinction also relates to registers, at least for the notions of superstrate and substrate, with superstrate influence being associated with the written and more formal registers and substrate with the spoken and more informal registers. There is also connection with the size of any two language communities: if one is a clear majority, then it is most likely to have its languages as a superstrate to the language of the minority group.

Third, we will use 'borrowing' vs 'shift', and distinguish between them along the lines of Thomason & Kaufman (1988) and Van Coetsem (1988). On the level of the languages involved, these processes are alike: one language, the target language, changes through interference from another language, the source language. On the level of the speakers involved the processes are different, however. In borrowing the target language speakers are more active: they take something from the source language, either a relatively concrete linguistic entity like a sound or a morpheme or something more abstract like a word order pattern – to put it in the terms of Matras & Sakel (2007), either 'MAT' ('matter') or 'PAT' ('pattern'). In shift, however, the source language speakers are the more active ones, as they learn the target language. They can

[2] With this correlative statement (*the more ... the more*) we imply that the notion of linguistic area is a fuzzy concept (cp. Campbell 2007 and Stolz 2006).

[3] Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli (2001) and Wälchli (2011) suggest that the concept of 'linguistic area' is not appropriate for the Circum-Baltic languages and propose 'contact superposition zone' instead, rather similar to Weinreich's (1958b: 378-379) proposal of 'convergence area'. We will gloss over these largely terminological proposals here (cp. Östman 2011: 374, van der Auwera 2001: 297-298),

[4] They are not the only ones, see e.g. Hickey (1999) for considering Ireland as a linguistic area or Wehr (2001) for a 'West-Atlantic' linguistic area, comprising Celtic, French and Portuguese.

[5] Even though there is a large literature on linguistic enclave and border situations, it generally focuses on sociolinguistic aspects and to the extent it deals with language, it tends to focus on the lexicon (see the point below about the levels of contact influence).

then bring in features from the source language, but the very fact of acquisition, typically imperfect, may also give the target language new properties, which themselves are not found in the source language and which typically make the target language in some respects either more simple or more complex. Note that a language shift scenario can, of course, lead to the disappearance of the source language. In that case, one ends up not with a linguistic area but with a contact-influenced new language. Of course, if the shifting language is documented and/or a closely related language is spoken in the same region, we may still observe areality: similarities of the target language with the disappearing source language or a language related to the source language. Note also that when shift itself simplifies or complexifies a target source, there can be no areal effect, for the simple or complex properties of the target source are not part of the source language.

Characterizing a change in terms of borrowing vs. shift or superstratal vs. substratal vs. adstratal is, of course, a simplification. The source language may be partly adstratal and partly superstratal, and the contact change may partly involve borrowing and partly shift. Also, as already adumbrated with the definition of the notion of 'areality', a change may be partially contact-based and partially 'something else'.

A few more general considerations are in order. Thus it is important to realize that there is a geographical dimension in the study of language that this chapter will not deal with. The Germanic family was once a dialect continuum stretching over an 'area' and this geographical dimension is reflected in the branching of the family into North, West and East Germanic. When the language family broke up in different languages, in part due to standardization, the languages that developed out of erstwhile neighboring dialects may still betray common features, either in the standard languages or in their dialects. A good illustration are the 'Ingvaeonic'[6] features of Dutch, Frisian and English. They include the absence of a nasal in English *five*, Dutch *vijf* and West Frisian *fiif* and the presence of one in German *fünf* and the existence of *h*-pronouns such as English *he*, Dutch *hij* and Frisian *hy* versus German *er*. These kinds of commonalities, reflecting erstwhile – or for that matter, current – dialect continua, stay out of the purview of this chapter. This does not mean, however, that when two languages are closely related and spoken next to each other, it is always easy to distinguish between similarities due to contact and similarities due to the fact they once formed a dialect chain.

Another kind of areality that we will largely leave undiscussed is the fact that a language may have acquired an international status through culture or religion and have influenced languages within that sphere. What we have in mind is Latin, later also French and German, mostly in Europe, and now English, not just in Europe but in the entire world.

A further point concerns the number of languages that are involved in the contact situation. The paragraph clarifying the distinction between borrowing and shift was phrased in terms of 'the' target language and 'the' source language. It is correct that many contact scenarios figure just two languages. But this is a simplification: in any one area more than two languages could be spoken and influence each other and the speakers involved may be, to some extent, multilingual rather than bilingual. Thus the East Frisian contact situation involves East Frisian and both Low German and High German and for North Frisian the speakers closest to the Danish border may have Danish as the fourth language (Århammar 2007). Nevertheless, for any one

[6] The term 'Ingvaeonic' is typical of Dutch linguistics and refers to the division of the Germanic tribes into Ingvaeones, Istvaeones and Erminones in Tacitus' *Germania*. One also finds the term 'North Sea Germanic'.

item of structure that switches between languages, the transfer probably always just happens between two languages; it is not or rarely the case that during the transfer part of that item or structure comes from one language and another part from a third one.

Also, in the research reflected in this chapter, there is a strong focus on the target language. This is understandable. In the case of borrowing, it is only the target language that changes and in the case of language shift, the source language may disappear (at least the variant that is involved in the shift scenario) and leave few or no traces. But one must be aware of simplification here too. A transfer could be reciprocal, with e.g. German borrowing Danish and Danish borrowing German along the Danish German language border. In that case both Danish and German are target languages. For some such pairs, both scenarios have been studied, but often independently. In the case of language shift – as already remarked in the above – the disappearance of the source language by no means implies that its transitional stage is not documented. Thus the Norman French that influenced English during the Middle English period did indeed disappear – at least in England – but not without leaving an enormous literature (e.g. Wogan-Browne 2009).

A next to last point is this: areal and contact linguistics is often concerned with what could be called the linguistic level(s) at which matter or patterns converge between languages, and, very specifically, whether there is a hierarchy of 'affectability' or 'borrowability' (see the introduction to this volume, Matras 2009: 153-165). Thus, uncontroversially, lexical items, and particularly, content words are more malleable than inflectional morphemes and quite often also than syntactic patterns. In what follows we will try to give a general feeling of the levels affected in the various contact scenarios, but we will give pride of place to morphosyntax. It is more interesting, precisely because of their lower malleability and because its lesser visibility, it is also more controversial.

Finally and obviously, the discussion cannot be complete. Though the survey touches upon a great many contact situations, some will not even be mentioned, in part because not much is known about them (e.g. Crimean Gothic, Swedish Walloon or Ukrainian Swedish) and of the 'great many' that do pass the review, the discussion will be superficial, yet all in all this chapter should make clear that the Germanic languages offer an extremely rich data set, from Proto-Germanic prehistory until today. In what follows, the more detailed discussion will involve hypotheses about the areal modification of the grammars of current languages, viz. English, Mainland North Germanic, Dutch, Afrikaans and, surprisingly perhaps, French. A moderate amount will also be devoted to the three partially Germanic 'mixed language'.

2. Areality within Germanic

An important early inner-Germanic contact situation concerns the Viking settlement in the British Isles (in the smaller Northern Isles but also in a large Northern part of England called 'Danelaw') during the fourth quarter of the first millennium. The languages of the Vikings (varieties of Old Norse) were close to Old and later Middle English, and they were predominantly adstratal. There was both borrowing and shift, with the speakers of Old and Middle English borrowing a lot of Old Norse lexicon and the Viking settlers taking Old Norse lexicon with them in the Old and Middle English that they were switching to. The lexical interference was aptly described by Otto Jespersen more than a century ago: '[A]n Englishman cannot *thrive* or *die* or be *ill* without Scandinavian words: *they* are to the language what *bread*

and *eggs* are to the daily fare' (Jespersen 1905: 80).The italics are Jespersen's and mark words taken from Scandinavian. These words include grammatical formatives such as *they*, and to that extent Old Norse influenced the grammar too. It is a matter of debate whether the substantial morphosyntactic simplification of English, as compared to its West Germanic sister languages, could, at least in part, be due to contact with the Vikings. Fischer (2013: 31-37) reviews this debate. From the fact that the loss of morphosyntactic variation happened faster in the North than in the South of England, she concludes that it is the imperfect learning in the shift from Old Norse to English that simplified English (a point already made by Jespersen 1922: 214 and repeated many times).

The influence of Old Norse on English is thus considerable, but because it is predominantly lexical and because the impact is not normally considered to make English very similar to North Germanic (yet see Emonds 2011 and Faarlund (2012) for the opposite view), it would not be appropriate to consider English and (some of) North-Germanic to constitute a linguistic area. Probably during the time that Old Norse was given up in English, Scandinavianized English and Anglicized Old Norse did form a small linguistic area, but this Anglicized Old Norse is not documented very well (yet see Hofmann 1955). It is a bit different in the extreme North, for the Vikings also settled Orkney, Shetland and the northern coast of Scotland. Here the switch happened much later, not to English but to Scots. The Old Norse, known as 'Norn' survived until the eighteenth century, in a progressively Scots-influenced version (Barnes 1998), and it left its mark on the local dialects, mostly their lexicons (Melchers & Sundkvist 2010). To the extent that the reciprocal influence was substantial, one could speak about a small linguistic area.

While the preceding paragraphs briefly touched upon North Germanic impinging on West Germanic, in this paragraph we focus on the reverse progress. In the second half of the 20th century the West Germanic language influencing North Germanic is English, but that is not very special given that English, due to its global role, exerts influence in the world at large. From the Reformation into the 19th century, it is High German that is important, but most impact dates back to the 13th to early 16th century, with Low German as the language of the Hansa League. This commercial enterprise took substantial numbers of speakers to mainland Scandinavian cities, more so in the Baltic South than in the North, both as transient and as resident traders. There Low German acted as superstrate but also as an adstrate, to the extent that Low German functioned as the Baltic *lingua franca*. Like adstratal Old Norse in England it contributed mainly to lexical MAT borrowing. The citation from Jespersen about the influence of Scandinavian on English is matched by one of his Norwegian colleague Didrik Arup Seip (1931: 102-103): "Two Norwegians cannot in our day carry on a conversation of 2-3 minutes without using L[ow] G[erman] loanwords ... of course without knowing that they are doing so. It is the same with Swedish and Danish".[7] Like in the English scenario some of the material serves grammatical purposes, particularly derivational affixes (e.g. Diercks 1983). The influence also extended to morphology, with a change from a three-gender system to a two gender-system in the Hanseatic Norwegian town of Bergen (Östman 2011: 371), and to syntax, with e.g. the replacement of Swedish *varda* by the Low German loan *bli(va)* for the pseudo-copula 'become' (Markey 1969). Moreover, the contact itself, with language mixing and imperfect learning, has been held responsible for the simplification in the grammars of Mainland North Germanic, compared with Insular North Germanic, or in those of the southern Swedish dialects, as compared to the

[7] The original is in Norwegian. The translation is ours, but for the first sentence we follow Haugen (1976: 316), who is responsible for sharing this line with a larger audience.

northern ones (Wessén 1929: 272; Haugen 1976: 285; Östman 2011: 371). But there is also evidence for complexification. For the replacement of *varda* by *bliva* Dahl (2009: 46) shows that it is complete in both the South, closer to the Hanseatic Baltic sphere of action, and the written standard, and that it is absent in the conservative Northern vernaculars. In the central dialects, however, Swedish has a complex system with *varda* and *bliva* competing depending on the form of verb. Interestingly, Dahl (2009: 46) mentions that the original meaning of Low German *bliva* is not 'become', but 'stay' – as it still is in modern German and Dutch – and that a similar semantic shift can be found in Polish, Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian. This puts the contact influence from Low German on North Germanic into the wider picture of the Circum-Baltic linguistic area. For this reason and also because the Low German influence had a considerable impact on morphology, one may invoke a notion of 'linguistic area' here, while there isn't any reason for invoking one for aligning English and North Germanic.

Interestingly, both English and mainland North Germanic are morphologically simple as compared to German (for English) and Icelandic (for mainland North Germanic). In that sense, they have become similar. Although there is a contact explanation for both processes of simplification, involving the Vikings for English and Low German Hansa traders for mainland North Germanic, the similarities are not a matter of areal convergence: the morphological simplicity of either English or mainland North Germanic is not ~~to~~ due to the morphological simplicity of the other language(s). Also, some of the parallels between North Germanic and English may also be due to the fact that both English and North Germanic are arguably not part of the core of the Standard Average European linguistic area and thus missed out on the convergence characterizing this core (see van der Auwera 1998a for an illustration involving phasal adverbials – *already, yet, still, not yet, no longer*).

What is also interesting about the Low German contact in the North is that there is some documentation of Scandinavian Low German. There may not be many studies, but see Carlie (1929) and Brattegard (1945) on the Low German of Bergen and Copenhagen, respectively. It seems that the influence of the North Germanic languages on Scandinavian Low German is modest in that it primarily concerned the orthography and the lexicon. At least part of the reason must be that Hanseatic Low German was after all a language of traders and travelers, not of migrants loosing contact with the homeland.

During the Middle Ages inner-Germanic contact influence in Scandinavia did not only involve Low German, but also the vernacular and standardizing North Germanic languages. The most important source language was Danish and the strongest contact influence, in the form of a superstrate, relates to Norwegian. Norway was ruled by Denmark from 1380 to 1814, and from the sixteenth century onwards the main written language in Norway was Danish. This written Danish-in-Norway gave rise to a spoken variety as well, and until today Dano-Norwegian or *Bokmål* 'book language', the current official term (earlier also *Riksmål* 'kingdom's language') is one of the two official Norwegian languages. The other one is 'New Norwegian' (*Nynorsk*) (earlier *landsmål* 'country language'), a standard created in the 19th century and based on Norwegian dialects. The 20th century saw an attempt to unite the two standards – the *Samnorsk* 'pan-Norwegian' project. The two varieties did converge somewhat, but they nevertheless remain distinct (Jahr 2004). Through *Bokmål* Norwegian thus belongs to a true, but small linguistic area, a 'Danosphere'[8], a part of the Circum-Baltic area.

There is also a Danish contact story to be told for Swedish, but it is of a different nature. The dialects in the southern part of Sweden, Scania (*Skåne*), were more Danish than Swedish in

[8] The term is inspired by Matisoff's (1991) use of the terms 'Sinosphere' and 'Indosphere'.

the dialect continuum between the two languages. Politically the area was Danish until 1658. After the annexation by the Swedes, a Swedification process started, with Swedish as the superstrate. This process appears to have been successful surprisingly fast (Haugen 1976: 351; Ohlsson 2004: 1367–). Nevertheless, today the Scanian dialects still retain Danish features, and there is a~~n~~ Scanian variant of standard Swedish. The Danish dialects native to the area now only survive on the island of Bornholm – off the Scanian coast, closer to Sweden than to Denmark, but protected from Swedification because it belongs to Denmark. Scanian is thus not Swedish that fell into the Danosphere, the way Norwegian did. It is the opposite: it is Danish that entered the 'Swedosphere'.[9]

Danish also served as the superstrate language for Faroese and Icelandic. Iceland was under Danish sovereignty from the Middle Ages until 1943 while the Faroe Islands are still part of the Kingdom of Denmark, though with 'home rule' since 1948. Due to its isolation, its larger population, its earlier and complete independence from Denmark as well as its early writing tradition (twelfth to fourteenth century), the impact of Danish is less strong in Icelandic than in Faroese (Worren 2002: 2037-2038) and less strong than that of Low German on Mainland Scandinavian, thus placing Faroese in the middle of a West to East cline from Iceland to Mainland Scandinavian (O'Neil 1978: 277-281; Van Coetsem 1988: 52), The Faroese also have a distinct Faro-Danish variety, which differs from Danish not just in the lexicon but also in the grammar. The Danosphere therefore extends to the West too. Does it extend to the South as well?

In the South, North Germanic Danish borders on West Germanic German and Frisian, but, as the North vs. West Germanic division suggests, there is no dialect continuum, probably because the region had no or few inhabitants at the end of the period of the Germanic migrations (Walker 2001: 266). There are, however, various border effects, maybe already in the 15th century (Pedersen 2009: 312) and definitely in the 19th and 20th centuries, with *Petuhtantendeutsch* or *Petuhsnak.* This variety was named after ladies (*Tanten* 'aunts') that had *Partout-tickets* on the ferries. It has a predominantly (High) German lexicon and a Low German and Danish (standard as well as dialectal) grammar (Faatz 2009; http:/petuhschnacker.de) The border area, Schleswig/Slesvig, was partitioned between a German and a Danish part in the aftermath of the First World War. As a result there is now a small German minority in the Danish part and a somewhat bigger Danish minority in the German part. Both the German and the Danish vernaculars show influence from their respective coterritorial languages (High German, Low German, Standard Danish and dialectal Danish, North Frisian) in lexicon, pronunciation and grammar (Pedersen 2000: 212-214, 2009: 306-307; Kühl & Petersen 2009).

Within West Germanic there is more contact influence and there are sometimes true contact varieties, on the borders between North and East Frisian and (Low) German (various chapters in Munske 2001), between West Frisian and Dutch (see below), between Low and High German, between German and Dutch (Smits 2009) and between German and Western Yiddish (Reershemius 2007). The most interesting variety might well be the one called *Stadsfries* in Dutch, literally 'Town Frisian'. It is not actually Frisian, and, in a sense, not really Dutch either. It is indeed a language of towns, more particularly of some of the towns in the province of Frisia in the Netherlands. Van Bree and Versloot (2008) convincingly argue that it arose in the 16th century when native West Frisian speakers learnt Dutch, the more prestigious language, but

[9] In prehistorical times, though, central urban Swedish may well have been in the Danosphere – to the extent that Dahl (2001) ventures the flippant question why Swedes speak Danish.

imperfectly so. To the extent that the original speakers intended to speak Dutch, their language can be considered to be a variety of Dutch with Frisian as a substrate. However, this substrate is so strong that *Stadsfries* became a language of its own, a 'mixed language' (Matras & Bakker eds 2003). Its accent, syntax, regular inflection and function words are mainly of West Frisian origin while its derivation, composition, irregular inflection and content words are primarily Dutch. No wonder there is some disagreement as to whether the language is 'basically' Frisian or 'basically' Dutch (Van Bree & Versloot 2008: 35-46). *Stadsfries* thus has a contact-based similarity to both Dutch and Frisian, but interestingly, it did not lead to one *Stadsfries* area, but to several ones, viz. the various Frisian towns.

Interestingly, the grammar of Dutch, as compared to that of English and German, has also been approached from a contact perspective. Comparing the three languages, English is morphologically simplest, German most complex and Dutch is in between. According to some, the deflexion of English is due to language contact – the Vikings. Weerman (2006) (and earlier but less explicitly also O'Neil 1978: 281) agrees and claims that the moderate deflexion seen in Dutch is also due to contact, viz. the influx of migrants in 16th- and 17th-century Amsterdam, the time and the place where the modern standard finds its origin. We thus see a geographical West to East gradient in West Germanic, similar to the North Germanic one (from Iceland over the Faroese Islands to mainland Scandinavia). Note, however, that both the deflexion of English and that of Dutch, though each arguably resulting from contact, do not constitute a case of areal convergence in the sense employed in this chapter. They are independent processes, just like those of mainland North Germanic and Faroese.

So much for a brief discussion of at least the most prominent areality effects involving the Germanic languages in Europe. But, of course, when the Europeans colonized the world, they took their languages with them and they interacted not only with the indigenous population but also with each other.[10] In this way Germanic languages met outside of Europe too. Usually we find contact scenarios with English as one of the partners, especially in the United States and in South Africa. In the United States most contact scenarios resulted in the disappearance of the 'other' Germanic language, although this process often took a few generations and the 'life and death' of such languages is sometimes well documented (e.g. the 200 years of Texas German, Boas 2009). The two Germanic languages that resist having their speakers shift to English are Pennsylvania German and, less successfully, Yiddish. It is religion and culture as well as the size of the community (compare the size and the fate of the two West Virginia communities studied by Van Ness (1990) to the size and the fate of the Pennsylvania ones studied by Meister Ferré (1994)) that keep the languages alive and the contact influence from English relatively modest. American English did not undergo much influence from them either – perhaps the most visible influence being some Yiddish-derived lexical items ('Yinglish', Gold 1985). In South Africa, it is Afrikaans, the 'colonial offshoot' of Dutch, that has resisted the language shift to English. The two languages have been in contact (of various types) for more than two centuries and have influenced each other at the lexical and the grammatical level (Donaldson 1991, Bowerman 2004). But the Afrikaans impact on South African English phonology and morphosyntax, though significant, should not be exaggerated (Lass & Wright 1986) (e.g. progressive *busy X-ing* was once considered a pure calque of Afrikaans *besig om te* but has recently been linked to Settler English; Mesthrie 2002). In the same vein, it is tempting to attribute English-like aspects of

[10] They typically took different dialects with them. This interdialect contact – contact again! – then led to dialect leveling and the formation of a new dialect, possibly out of line with the regular dialect continuum (?) back home.

Afrikaans to influence from English but such similarities may well be the result of independent evolutions (e.g. Colleman 2013): as the Germanic 'contact languages *par excellence*' (Van Coetsem 1988: 137), English and Afrikaans have both undergone extreme deflection (see also section 3.6) and are not unlikely to develop in comparable ways.

3. Areality with Germanic and non-Germanic

In one sense, contact-based similarities between Germanic and non-Germanic should be easier to detect than inner-Germanic ones: the intrusion of non-Germanic sounds, words or patterns should be clearly visible, and *vice versa* for the intrusion of Germanic into non-Germanic. However, to describe the finer details one needs an expert in (at least) two language families, e.g. Germanic and Celtic, and it is not easy to acquire such skills. The language contact may also date back very far, which makes even the detection of the similarity very difficult, as we see in the first contact situation to be discussed.

3.1. Semitic

In prehistoric Europe (from the fifth millennium BC extending into our era), Vennemann claims – in two collections (2003, 2012) with the titles *Europa Vasconica – Europa Semitica* and *Germania Semitica* echoing Gamillscheg's *Romania Germanica* (1934-1936) – speakers of Semitic languages (probably Phoenician) were present on the Atlantic coast of Europe and exerted a superstrate influence on Indo-European. This influence particularly targeted the languages that were to become 'Germanic'. The argumentation is based on cultural and mythological similarities as well as linguistic ones. Thus Germanic verbal ablaut (i.e. the Germanic strong verb system) and a good part of the 'sizable'[11] non-European lexicon of Germanic would be due to this superstrate influence. According to Vennemann (2003, 2012), Indo-European also underwent a prehistoric, substratal influence from Vasconic (the family that Basque is the survivor of), but this influence did not specifically target Germanic. Despite the big depth of the hypothesized contact influence, the argumentation is rather detailed, but also speculative and it competes with Nostratic attempts to explain Indo-European Semitic similarities (Bomhard & Kerns 1994).

A modern Semiticized Germanic language is Yiddish, with superstrate input mainly in the vocabulary of about 12 to 20 % (Jacobs et al. 1994: 417) and marginally also in morphology (with the nominal pluralizer *–im* in *profesoyrim* 'professors', a pejorative alternative for *profesorn*; Jacobs 1994: 402). One would not, however, bring in notion of 'linguistic area' to explain the similarity. The Semitic superstrate effect does not, of course, come from an adjacent or coterritorial group of speakers of Aramaic and Hebrew. It is a subset of the speakers of Yiddish themselves that also speak or at least use Aramaic and Hebrew. The Semitic effect on Yiddish is thus similar to the Latin and Greek effect on European languages.[12]

[11] The size of this part of the lexicon is unclear: for Polomé (1972: 45) it is 'substantial', for Hawkins (1987: 74-75) it could be a 'full one third' and for Vennemann (e.g. 2012: 257) even 'close to two thirds'.

[12] The areal effect of Latin and Greek on European languages and that of Hebrew and Aramaic on Yiddish is not quite the same though. Thus Kortmann (1988) does give Latin and Greek a role in the formation of linguistic areas, i.e. the Balkan one for Greek and Standard Average European for Latin, and Drinka (2013) does the same with Carolingian Latin in relation to the Charlemagne core of Standard Average European.

3.2. Finno-Ugric

Vennemann's hypothesis that earliest Germanic was a contact language relates to Vasconic and Semitic. But there is another view on the contact language status of Germanic, based on phonetics, that takes Germanic to have involved a Finno-Ugric substrate and a language shift from Finno-Ugric speakers (Wik 1997). This view is also contested, though not the less radical claim that Finno-Ugric and Germanic have been in contact for a long time (Koivulehto 2002), to some extent as part of the Circum-Baltic area (Wälchli 2011: 326). And instead of contact, a common origin, in Nostratic, might explain some of the similarities.

In historical times, Finno-Ugric interacted with both North-Germanic and West-Germanic. Both Norwegian and Swedish interacted with Sami languages (e.g. Bergsland 1992) and with Finnish. In addition, Swedish interacted with Estonian and some minor Finnic languages, which in turn (except for Sami) interacted with Low German and later High German – and often also a Baltic and/or Slavic language. In Norway and Sweden, the Finno-Ugric languages are minority languages, and in Finland and earlier also Estonia, it is the other way round. The Finnish-Swedish contact is described best (see Lagman, Ohlsson & Voodla eds 2002, Ohlsson 2004 for references to other situations) and it is also rather special, in the sense that Swedish used to be the only 'official' and high-prestige language and that the minority that speaks it as a native language is not so small (some 290.000 speakers). In its written form Finland Swedish is very similar to Sweden Swedish. The spoken variants are rather different, both because of their dialect base and because of the influence from Finnish. The latter is especially clear in the pronunciation (e.g. Helgason, Ringen & Suomi in print) and the lexicon, with so many intrusions from Finnish that they have been the target of purists for more than a century (Östman 2011: 366). This variant of Swedish is the one that is best described. Others include the Finland Swedish used by native speakers of Finnish and the Swedish spoken by the sizable Finnish immigrant community in Sweden.

The other major Finno-Ugric language of Europe, i.e. Hungarian, interacted with Germanic, too, in this case, German. Most of the Hungarian Germans trace their ancestry to migration waves of the late 17th and most of the 18th century taking settlers into present-day Hungary, but also into present-day Romania and Serbia, when these areas fell under the Habsburg monarchy. The villagewise settlement created linguistic enclaves, a phenomenon for which German linguistics has appropriated the term *Sprachinsel* (lit. 'language island'). In these enclaves contact influence went in both directions, mostly, as expected, involving lexicon and pronunciation (Manherz & Wild 1987, Knipf-Komlósi 2006).

3.2. Romance

English is the most Romance of the major Germanic languages. This is due in part to Latin, which influenced its lexicon – but this happened for all the Germanic languages – but primarily to French, which acted as a superstrate as a consequence of the invasion by William the Conqueror in 1066 and the ensuing colonization of the British Isles. The influence is visible in the lexicon (with an estimated 38% of the 4000 most common words – Scheler 1977: 70-77, Lutz 2002: 147, Duffin 2014: 254-280) and in derivational morphology (e.g. *–ment* or *–(a)tion-*;

Dalton-Puffer 1996).[13] Syntax has largely remained untouched, as Miller (2012: 185-186) and Fischer (2013: 38-40) argue after a scrutiny of the literature. The impact on the lexicon, it should be noted, was partially a matter of replacing Anglo-Saxon and partially a matter of enriching it. As a result, the lexicon became more complex. The now obligatory choice between *sheep* and *mutton* is a case in point: the former comes from Anglo-Saxon, the latter from French. Another example is the stylistic difference between Anglo-Saxon *help* and 'French' *aid* or *assist*. The variety of French that crossed the channel with the Normans was 'Norman French', itself a contact variety of French with minor lexical input from Old Norse. Once settled on the British Isles, it can be called 'Anglo-Norman' and it initially functioned as the mother tongue of the invaders and it progressively became a language learned through instruction. Because the language left a large body of texts from the Conquest in 1066 until the 15th century, we can see it change throughout the centuries. Thus Ingham (2012) focuses on the grammar and shows how Anglo-Norman diverged from continental French first in the phonology, then the morphology and finally and only marginally the syntax.

With this clear areal influence from (a kind of) French on English and back there is some temptation to 'gild' it with the concept of 'linguistic area'. But this is not done. English, different from French, is also strongly influenced by North Germanic (see above) and probably also by Celtic (see below). Interestingly, there are two parallels to the English-French contact scenario just sketched. For the first, we have to go to the Channel Isles of Jersey, Guernsey and Sark, where something like Anglo-Norman French still survives – but probably not for very long anymore. These dialects are similar to the ones of the Norman mainland, but they have more Anglicisms, given that the standard superstrate language of the islands is English and that of the mainland is French (Spence 1984). They also colored, substratewise, the English spoken there, the 'Channel Island English' (Jones 2010). For the second parallel, we have to go to the French mainland.

If English is the most Romance of the Germanic languages, French has been called 'the most Germanic of the Romance languages' (Walter 1994: 225, Hélix 2011: 12). This 'Germanization' is a result of the migrations of Germanic tribes into the (Gallo-)Romance lands that were part of the Roman Empire, involving Goths, Lombards, Burgundians, Saxons and Franks[14]. The effect on the Romance lexicon and toponymy is well described (Gamillscheg 1934-1936). The language most affected by the migrations was French and as the name of this language already suggests the crucial Germanic language was Frankish (Franconian), most clearly surviving as Dutch and the Franconian dialects of German. The Franks conquered parts of present-day France, settled in the North amidst the Gallo-Romance population, and ruled a mixed Romance-Germanic area, with more Germanic in the North, from the end of the 5th century. In this bilingual area Frankish was a superstrate – we have to wait until king Hugh Capet of the second half of the 10th century to have a ruler that did not have Frankish as a mother tongue (Picoche & Marchello-Nizia 1994:13) – and probably also an adstrate, in the Northern areas with the denser Frankish settlement. The Frankish influence on the Gallo-Romance of the North (the *langue d'oïl* as opposed to the *langue d'oc* or Occitan of the South), which was to

[13] If the morphological attrition of English is associated with language contact, it is probably the contact with Old Norse that is relevant here, as mentioned above. But one has also associated it with Norman French (e.g. Wessén 1929: 272, Mossé 1952: 44).

[14] These languages are West-Germanic (Frankish, Lombardic, Saxon) or East-Germanic (Gothic, Burgundian). But as mentioned earlier, North-Germanic Old Norse also infiltrated Romance, viz. Norman French, and this way, to a minor extent, the later standard French.

become standard French, did not only concern toponymy and lexicon. According to Mitterand (1968: 18), about 35 of the 1000 most common current French words come from Frankish or some other older Germanic language. But the influence is also evident in phonology (e.g. the diphtongisation of Latin *tres* 'three' into French *trois*) and grammar. For grammar the literature usually mentions the more frequent anteposition of the attributive adjective in Old French – still reflected in toponyms (e.g. Northern *Neufchatel* 'new castle' vs. Southern *Châteuneuf*) – and the entry of some morphology (e.g. the suffix *–ard*). The most interesting 'Germanic-like' features are the non-pro-drop character of French, i.e. the requirement a non-emphatic subject pronoun in French *je t'aime* (lit) 'I you love' (cp. Italian *ti amo* (lit.) 'you love'), and the fact that Old French was a 'verb-second' language, requiring a verb in the second slot of the sentence. Interestingly, the view that these two features are not only superficially Germanic but at least in part due to contact influence from Germanic (with a language shift scenario) has not been given much attention in recent years. Thus it is not discussed by Picoche and Marchello-Nizia (1994) or Marchello-Nizia (1995)[15], for instance, or one contents oneself with observing the similarity between French and Germanic (Rainsford, Guillot, Lavrentiev & Prévost 2012: 175). This stance contrasts with that of earlier linguists (particularly von Wartburg 1946: 66; 1967: 102-104; but also Hilty 1968: 507-511) and of linguists that have tried to define 'Standard Average European' and even posit a Charlemagne area as its core (van der Auwera 1998, implicitly Haspelmath 1998, 2001 – cp. also Drinka 2013). The parallel with the French influence on English is clear, but partial. In both cases the language that arrived later, French in England and Frankish in France, came in as a superstrate. But in the North of France the incoming language must have been adstratal as well. It led to a wider bilingualism and to a slow language shift. In that sense the scenario is closer that of the North Germanic contact influence on English, which was also adstratal and involved bilingualism and language shift. Interestingly, in France this kind of contact lead to the calquing of syntax. This is not clear in England, but the reason is perhaps that the syntax of Old and Middle English and Old Norse was already very similar. In English, the language shift is taken to have led to morphological simplification. Interestingly, such a claim is not unreasonable for French either. In many ways French is phonetically and morphologically simpler than the other Romance languages. To some extent this difference is similar to the way English is phonetically and morphologically simpler than the other West Germanic languages (Lamiroy 2011) and – a further parallel – to the way Mainland North Germanic is simpler than Icelandic and Faroese. If the simplification of English and that of Mainland North Germanic are at least partially due to language contact, it is tempting to investigate whether a similar claim could make sense for French.

The interaction of Frankish and French did not stop when Hugh Capet ascended the French throne more than a millennium ago. Dutch descends from Frankish and it never stopped interacting with French. A very special case is Luxembourgish, now the national language of Luxembourg (functioning along French and German as 'administrative languages'), a Frankish variety with a lexicon particularly receptive to French.[16] Going south along the Romance Germanic language border and into Switzerland and Italy brings us to many more German-

[15] Marchello-Nizia (1995: 61-65) surveys the various explanations of the V2 character of Old French, starting with Le Coultre (1875), considered typical of the period in which linguists were discussing to what extent French was 'Germanized'. For later research, she does not mention the contact influence hypothesis (Marchello-Nizia 1995: 62).

[16] The study of the synchronic and diachronic grammar of Luxembourgish has only just started (Moulin & Nübling eds. 2006).

Romance contact varieties. Some are German influenced Romance, such as the Rhaeto-Romance of the Swiss Canton of Graubünden/Grischun, which has a verb second word order, at least partially due to German (Kaiser & Scholze 2009) and there is also Romance influenced German, such as Cimbrian. Cimbrian refers to German enclaves in the North of Italy, with a strongly Italian influenced Bavarian of the originally 11th- and 12th-century migrants (Bidese, Dow and Stolz (eds.) et al 2005). In the Balkans German interacted with Romanian (Gadeanu 1998) and out of Europe, English and French interact(ed) in Canada and in the US (e.g. Ruth 2000 on English influence on Acadian French morphosyntax; Poplack 2008 and Boberg 2012 on the predominantly lexical influence of French on Quebec English), in the US English interacts with Spanish (e.g. Roca and Lipski 1993; Otheguy and Zentella 2012 on the presence/absence of subject pronouns in Spanish in New York), and in Latin America the Low German of the Mennonites interacts with Spanish and Portuguese (Kaufmann 2011).

3.3. Celtic

When Germanic tribes, in this case Saxons, Angles and Jutes, settled in the British Isles in the fifth century the population they met spoke Celtic languages. The two groups mixed and by the end of the first millennium Anglo-Saxon had replaced Celtic in most of England. This process would continue – but not to completion – in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. Celtic was the substrate, responsible for toponyms and a very small set of lexical items and no more needs to be said. At least, that was the agreed opinion until recently and to some extent it still is: when Fischer (2013) discusses the role of contact for syntax in the Old and Middle English periods Celtic is not mentioned and Townend (2012: 104) writes that 'sadly the possible influence of Celtic on English (besides the handful of loanwords [...]) remains obscure an disputed'. But the view that Celtic did play an important role in shaping English grammar has gained ground (Filppula, Klemola & Pitkänen eds. 2002; Hickey 2012), with McWhorter (2008: 61) echoing Jespersen on North Germanic in English and Seip on Low German in North Germanic when he describes English as a language 'whose speakers today use Celtic-derived constructions almost every time they open their mouths for longer than a couple of seconds. *Do you want to leave now? What's he doing? Did he even know? What are you thinking? I don't care. She's talking to the manager.'* The constructions he refers to are *do* periphrasis and the progressive (van der Auwera & Genee 2002; Filppula 2002). The list is not restricted to these two features: White (2002: 169-170) lists as many as 52 possible 'Brittonicisms'[17], as good a prospect as any for daring to advance a *Sprachbund* hypothesis (Tristram 1999, Filppula, Klemola & Paulasto 2008: 228-229) and for keeping both English and Celtic out of the Standard Average European core (van der Auwera 1998b). Like for the Frankish influence on French syntax, the process deemed responsible is language shift, with Celtic learners of English calquing features of Celtic.

Again, like for Romance-Germanic contact on the continent, Celtic and English continue to interact until today, in the regional varieties of English spoken close to or in areas with modern or earlier speakers of Welsh, Irish, Scots Gaelic, Cornish and Manx (Filppula, Klemola & Paulasto 2008: 135-220). The opposite contact influence is also very real but it is less well described (e.g. Jones 1973 for Welsh and Stenson 1993 for Irish).

3.4. Balto-Slavic

[17] This list includes morphological attrition, more commonly associated with Scandinavian contact (see above), rarely also with Norman French contact (note x). See also Tristram (2002).

We have already discussed that the Baltic area was the stage for an interaction between Low German and later High German with North Germanic and Finno-Ugric. The contact also involved Slavic and Baltic languages and among the latter Latvian stands out, a contact which gave rise to the Latvian (and Estonian) influenced *Baltendeutsch* of the German settlers and the *Halbdeutsch* of the mother tongue speakers of primarily Latvian and Estonian but other languages too (e.g. Polish, Russian). Best described are the influences in the pronunciation and the lexicon (see Polanska 2002 for Latvian-in-German and Jordan 1995 for German-in-Latvian). Further east and south, German interacted with Slavic languages, esp. North and East Slavic, but also South Slavic (esp. Slovenian), not necessarily coterritorial, with mutual lexical enrichment, also in the realm of function words (e.g. the modal verb *müssen* 'must', Hansen 2000). The influence can also be more subtle as when one expresses uncertainty with either a verb meaning 'may' – the Western, Standard Average European strategy – or with an adverb meaning 'maybe' – the Eastern strategy (van der Auwera, Schalley & Nuyts 2005). Apart from the contacts along the German-Slavic line, there is also the typically German *Sprachinsel* phenomenon. Thus German settlers created small and large German enclaves in Russia, starting in 1765, the most well-known one that of the Volga Germans, creating varieties of Russian German (Berend & Jedig 1991). A particular twist of the contact history of this variant is that many of the 'Russian Germans' have now remigrated to Germany, allowing their Russian German –as well as their German Russian – to be influenced by varieties of 'German German' (Berend 1998, 2009). There are also two Slavic enclaves in German speaking areas, viz. the West Slavic enclaves of Sorbian in the eastern part of Germany (Scholze 2008) and the South Slavic enclaves of Burgenland Croatian in eastern Austria (e.g. Pawischitz 2009). We should also mention Yiddish, in its Eastern variety, interacting with Baltic (esp. Lithuanian) and Slavic (esp. non-standard varieties of Polish, Ukrainian, Belarussian and Russian), mainly in the lexicon – including grammatical formatives such as the question particle *czy* and the conjunction *abi* 'if only' – but also in the phonology and morphosyntax (Weinreich 1958a, Eggers 1998, Jacobs 2010) – with e.g. the Slavic style reanalysis of verbal prefixes (Talmy 1982, Kiefer 2010). There is also a claim that Yiddish is basically Slavic (Sorbian, Ukrainian and Belarussian), relexified into High German and, as the process continued, Yiddish-*in-statu-nascendi* (Wexler 2002).

3.5. Indo-Aryan

A particularly interesting case is the contact of Germanic with the Indo-Aryan language Romani, the language of the Roma. The Romani varieties of groups that lived in or passed through Germanic lands show influence from the Germanic languages, particularly German., But in two cases the contact also led to mixed languages, called 'Para-Romani' in Romani scholarship. One is Angloromani (Hancock 2010) and the other Scandoromani (Hancock 1992, Lindell & Thorbjörnsson-Djerf 2008). In both cases, the grammar is strongly Germanic while the lexicon is Romani. In this respect the languages are like *Stadsfries* and a further similarity is that the languages are not confined to one area, but to many small ones, not in cities this time but in diaspora. But there is an interesting difference too. For *Stadsfries* the substrate (Frisian) is prominent in the grammar, for Para-Romani the substrate (Romani) is prominent in the lexicon. This difference may be related to their different origin. Whether Para-Romani is a late stage of the abandonment of the 'real' Romani, surviving mostly in lexical items (Matras 2009: 295) or a

consequence of an effort to make a secret language (Hancock 1992: 43-44) or even partially both (Hancock 2010: 374), these scenarios are irrelevant for *Stadsfries* and Frisian.

3.6. Other

Germanic interacted with other families too, e.g. Eskimo-Aleut languages (Danish in Greenland, and English in Alaska and Canada or American Indian languages in the US and Canada. In South Africa we find Dutch interacting with a number of language families. When Dutch was stabilizing and nativizing there, it was in immediate contact not only with the Khoisan language of the indigenous population but also with the languages of the Asian and African slaves that were brought to the Cape, Malay and Creole Portuguese in particular (as well as with the French, German and English of other migrants from Europe). Later on, it also interacted with the Bantu languages spoken in the rest of South Africa (Van Rensburg 2012). The lexical influence on the language cannot be denied (e.g. the Afrikaans words *dagga* 'cannabis', *baie* 'very/much', *mielie* 'corn/maize' and *babelas* 'hangover' come from Khoisan, Malay, Creole Portuguese and Bantu respectively). The impact on the grammar, however, has been the subject of debate for a long time, as it relates directly to the question of the origin of Afrikaans: is it (like) a creole (e.g. Hesseling 1923) or has it developed out of Dutch autonomously (e.g. Smith 1952), possibly with some dialect leveling and convergence? These two extreme positions seem untenable, though. First, Afrikaans exhibits just a few of the 'typical' features of creoles (Markey 1982) and has preserved the Dutch word order rules of V-second in main clauses and V-final in subordinate clauses, unlike 'real' creoles based on the language (Biberauer 2009: 9). Second, the autonomous evolution view cannot explain the drastic changes that Dutch underwent between 1652, when the settlers arrived, and the end of the 18th century, when the Europeans as well as the Khoi and the slaves already spoke something very Afrikaans-like (Raidt 1983). A more likely account involves the interaction of, on the one hand, the Dutch that was spoken and transmitted by the Europeans (a more conservative force) and served as the superstrate of the Cape Colony and, on the other hand, the Dutch that the Khoi and the slaves learned 'imperfectly' and ended up switching to en masse (a more progressive force) (e.g. Van Coetsem 1988: 129-144, Den Besten 1989). This process resulted not only in morphological simplification (similar to what happened to English, French and Mainland North Germanic) but also in some 'complexification'. The varieties of the Khoi and the slaves were probably heavily influenced by the languages that they initially spoke – in fact, the three main dialects of present-day Afrikaans still reflect the varying degrees of influence from Khoisan (Orange River Afrikaans), Malay (Cape Afrikaans) and Settler Dutch (Eastern Cape Afrikaans) (Van Rensburg 1983) – and the origin of particular complexities of Afrikaans has been a matter of considerable discussion among scholars (e.g. Den Besten 1986 and Bernini & Ramat 1996: 51-81 on the Dutch, Khoisan and/or Creole Portuguese basis of the double negation with the clause-final marker *nie*). Note, finally, that the contact between Afrikaans and Bantu has also given rise to new varieties (e.g. *Flaaitaal* 'Fly Language', a township argot primarily used by black men in urban areas; Makhudu 2002).

4. Conclusion

The study of the areal linguistics of Germanic has a good side to it as well as a bad side. The good side is that both the linguistic and the extralinguistic phenomena are reasonably well

documented, at least in comparison with most other language families. The bad side to the study of Germanic areality is that many Germanic languages as well as the non-Germanic ones that they have been in contact with have been standardized, and standardization inhibits contact influence. For this reason the more interesting areality effects are to be found in either the period before these languages were standardized or in the non-standard varieties usually found in borders regions, including the borders of linguistic enclaves. These two situations are also what we have focused on in this chapter. A further focus was on the areality of grammar, the reason being that grammar is taken to be rather stable, as compared to the lexicon. In this respect the Germanic languages are quite special: "[...] the Germanic group is only with some difficulty and chiefly historically kept together from the point of view of their grammars' (O'Neil 1978: 281) and this divergence is arguably due to contact, at least in part. This is most strongly arguable for the morphosyntactic simplification of English due to contact with North Germanic (and perhaps Celtic too) as well as for the morphosyntactic simplification of Mainland North Germanic due to contact with Low German. For both West and North Germanic languages it is also argued that the intensity of the contact resulted in East West clines, from English to Dutch (and Frisian) and then German, and from Icelandic to Faroese and then Mainland North Germanic. Further parallels are the simplification of Afrikaans relative to Dutch arguably due to contact with Khoi and other languages, and that of French arguably due to contact with Frankish. In each of these four cases the process would primarily involve language shift and imperfect learning, factors that are also claimed to have resulted in at least three 'mixed languages', viz. Angloromani, Scandoromani and *Stadsfries*. In some cases these areal convergences feature as elements in the argumentation for linguistic areas. Thus the Hanseatic separation of the Mainland North Germanic languages happened in the Circumbaltic linguistic area, the 'Germanization' of French in the Standard Average European linguistic area, and the Celticization of English in a British Isles linguistic area.

References

Århammer, Nils. 2007. 'Das Nordfriesische, eine bedrohte Minderheitssprache in zehr Dialekten: eine Bestandsaufnahme', in Munske, Horst Haider (ed.) *Sterben die Dialekte aus? Vorträge am interdisziplinären Zentrum für Dialektforschung an der Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, 22.10 – 10.12 2007.* <http://www.dialektforschung.phil.uni-erlangen.de/sterben dialekte/ accessed on 4 Nov 2013>

Bandle, Oskar, Kurt Braunmüller & Ernst Håkon Jahr (eds.) 2002-2004. *The Nordic languages: an international handbook on the history of the North Germanic languages*. 2 vols. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Barnes, Michael P. 1998. *The Norn language of Orkney and Shetland*. Lerwick: The Shetland Times.

Berend, Nina. 1998. *Sprachliche Anpassung. Eine sociolinguistische-dialektologische Untersuchung zum Rußlanddeutschen.* Tübingen: Narr.

Berend, Nina. 2009. 'Vom Sprachinseldialekt zur Migrantensprache. Anmerkungen zum Sprachwandel der Einwanderungsgeneration', in Wolf-Andreas Liebert & Horst Schwinn (eds.) *Mit Bezug auf Sprache. Festschrift für Rainer Wimmer*. Tübingen: Narr, 361-381.

Berend, Nina & Hugo Jedig. 1991. *Deutsche Mundarten in der Sowjetunion. Geschichte der Forshung und Bibliographie.* Marburg: Elwert.

Bergsland, Knut. 1992. 'Language contacts between Southern Sami and Scandinavian', in Jahr (ed.), 5-15.

Bernini, Giuliano & Paolo Ramat. 1996. *Negative Sentences in the Languages of Europe: A Typological Approach*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Biberauer, Teresa. 2009. Afrikaans. In: Keith Brown & Sarah Oglive (eds.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Languages of the World.* Oxford: Elsevier, 7-11.

Bidese, Ermenegildo, James R. Dow & Thomas Stolz (eds.) 2005. *Das Zimbrische zwischen Germanisch und Romanisch*. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Boas, Hans C. 2009. *The life and dealth of Texas German*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Boberg, Charles. 2012. 'English as a minority language in Quebec', *World Englishes* 31: 493-502.

Bomhard, Allan R. & John C. Kerns. 1994. *The Nostractic macrofamily. A study in distant linguistic relationship*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bowerman, Sean. 2004. White South African English: Morphology and Syntax. In Bernd Kortmann, Kate Burridge, Rajend Mesthrie, Edgar W. Schneider & Clive Upton (eds.), *A Handbook of Varieties of English. Volume 2: Morphology and Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 948-961

Brattegard, Olav. 1945/*1945. Die mittelniederdeutsche Geschäftssprache des hansischen Kaufmanns zu Bergen. 2 vols.* Bergen: A.S. John Griegs Boktrykkeri.

Braunmüller, Kurt. 1991. *Die skandinavischen Sprachen im Überblick.* Stuttgart: UTB.

Braunmüller, Kurt & Juliane House (eds.) 2009. *Convergence and divergence in language contact situations*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Campbell, Lyle. 2006. 'Areal linguitics: A closer scrutiny', in Matras, McMahon & Vincent (eds.), 1-31.

Carlie, Johan. 1925. *Studium über die mittelniederdeutsche Urkundensprache der dänischen Köningskanzlei von 1330-1430 nebst einer Übersicht überdie Kanzleiverhältnisse.* Lund: Gleerupska Universitetsbokhandeln.

Colleman, Timothy. 2013. 'n Germaanse toebroodjie: Three cases of English influence on the grammar of Afrikaans. Paper at the Germanic Sandwich conference held at the University of Leuven in January.

Dahl, Östen. 2001. 'The origin of the Scandinavian languages', in Dahl, Ósten & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), 215-235.

Dahl, Ósten & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.) *Circum-Baltic languages. 2 vols.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 215-235.

Dahl, Östen. 2009. 'Issues in complexity as a result of language contact', in Braunmüller & House (eds.), 41-52.

Dalton, Puffer, Christiane. 1996. *The French influence on middle English morphology a corpus-based study of derivation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Den Besten, Hans. 1986. Double negation and the genesis of Afrikaans. In: Pieter Muysken & Norval Smith (eds.), *Substrata and Universals in Creole Genesis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 185-230.

Den Besten, Hans. 1989. From Khoekhoe foreignertalk via hottentot Dutch to Afrikaans: The creation of a novel grammar. In: Martin Piitz & René Dirven (eds.), *Wheels within Wheels: Papers of the Duisburg Symposium on Pidgin and Creole Languages*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 207-250.

Diercks, Willy. 1993. 'Zur Verwendung prä- und postmodifizierender Morpheme in Mittelniederdeutschen und in den skandinavischen Sprachen', in Braunmüller, Kurt & Willy Diercks (eds.) *Niederdeutsch und die skandivavischen Sprachen I.* Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 161-194.

Donaldson, Bruce C. 1991. *The Influence of English in Afrikaans: A Case Study of Linguistic Change in a Language Contact Situation.* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Drinka, Bridget. 2013. 'Sources of auxiliation in the perfects of Europe', *Studies in Language* 37: 599-644.

Duffin, Philip. 2014. *Borrowed words. A history of loanwords in English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eggers, Eckhard. 1998. *Sprachwandel und Sprachmisshung im Jiddischen.* Frankfurt: Lang.

Emonds, Joseph. 2012. 'English as a North Germanic language: from the Norman Conquest to the present', in Roman Trušnik, Katarína Nemčoková & Gregory Jason Bell (eds.) *Theories and practice. Proceedings of the second international conference on English and American studies.* Zlín: Univerzita Tomáše Bati, 13-26.

Faarlund, Jan Terje (2012) https://www.apollon.uio.no/english/articles/2012/4-english-scandinavian.html, accessed on Feb 25, 2014.

Faatz, Jan Patrick. 2009. *Uwer unse Sprak is nich gut un warn klok ut .... Eine Untersuchung zum Gebrauch des Petuhtantendeutsch in der heutigen flensburger Alltagssprache.* Norderstedt: Grin.

Filppula, Markku. 2002. 'More on the English progressive and the Celtic connection', in Hildegard L.C. Tristram (ed.) *The Celtic Englishes III.* Heidelberg Winter: 150-168.

Filppula, Markku, Juhani Klemola & Heli Pitkänen (eds.) 2002. *The Celtic roots of English*. Joensuu: Joensuu Yliopistopaino.

Filppula, Markku, Juhani Klemola & Heli Paulasto. 2008. *English and Celtic in Contact*. London: Routledge.

Fischer, Olga. 2013. 'The role of contact in English syntactic change in Old and Middle English periods', in Schreier & Hundt (eds), 18-40.

Gadeanu, Sorin. 1998. *Sprache auf der Suche. Zur Identiätsfrage des Deutschen in Rumänian am Beispiel der Temerwarer Stadtsprache*. Regenburg: Roderer.

Gamillscheg, Ernst. 1934-1936. *Romania Germanica*. *Sprach-und Siedlungsgeschichte der Germanen auf dem Boden des alten Römerreichs*. 3 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Gold, David L. 1985. 'Jewish English', in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.) *Readings in the sociology of the Jewish languages*. Leiden: Brill, 280-298.

Hancock, Ian. 2010. 'Romani and Angloromani', in Schreier, Daniel, Peter Trudgill, Edgard W. Schneider & Jeffrey P. Williams (eds.), 367-383.

Hansen, Björn. 2000. 'The German modal verb *müssen* and the Slavonic languages. The reconstruction of a success story', *Scando-Slavica* 46, 77-93.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1998. 'How young is Standard Average European?', *Language Sciences* 20: 271-287.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2001. ''The European linguistic area: Standard Average European', in Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wolfgang Oesterreicher, and Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language Typoloogy and Language Universals. Sprachtypologie und sprachliche Universalien. Sprachtypologie und sprachliche Universalien: La typologie des langues et les universaux*

linguistiques: An international handbook: Ein internationales Handbuch: Manuel international. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1492-1510.

Haugen, Einar. 1976. *The Scandinavian languages. An introduction to their history*. London: Faber and Faber.

Hawkins, John A. 1987. 'The Germanic languages', in Bernard Comrie (ed.) *The world's major languages*. London: Routledge, 68-76.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2006. *The changing languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Helgason, Pétur, Catherine Ringen & Kari Suomi. In print. 2013. 'Swedish quantity: Central Standard Swedisgh and Fenno-Swedish', *Journal of Phonetics.*

Hélix, Laurence. 2011. *Histoire de la langue française*. Paris: Ellipses.

Hesseling, Dirk .C, 1923, *Het Afrikaans*. Leiden: Brill.

Hickey, Raymond. 1999. 'Ireland as a linguistic area', in James P. Mallory (ed.) *Language in Ulster*. Holywood : Ulster Folk and Transport Museum [Special issue of *Ulster Folklife* 45], 36-53.

Hickey, Raymond. 2012. 'Early English and the Celtic hypothesis', in Terttu Nevalainen & Elizabeth Closs Traugott (eds.) *The Oxford handbook on the history of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 497-507.

Hickey, Raymond (ed.) 2012. *Areal features of the Anglophone world*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton

Hilty, G. 1968. 'Westfränkische Superstrateinflüsse auf die galloromanische Syntax', in K. Baldinger (ed.) *Festschrift W. v. Wartburg zum 80. Geburtstag*. *Vol 1*. Tübingen, 493-510.

Hofmann, Dietrich. 1955. *Nordisch-englische Lehnbeziehungen der Wikingerzeit*. Kopenhagen: Munksgaard.

Ingham, Richard (ed.) 2010. *The Anglo-Norman language and its contexts*. Woodbridge: Boydell.

Ingham, Richard. 2012. *The transmission of Anglo-Norman. Language history and language acquisition*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Jacobs, Neil G. 2001. 'Yiddish in the Baltic region', Dahl, Ósten & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), 285-311

Jacobs, Neil G., Ellen F. Prince & Johan van der Auwera. 1994. 'Yiddish', Ekkehard König & Johan van der Auwera (eds.) *The Germanic languages*. London: Routledge, 388-419.

Jahr, Ernst Håkon. 2004. 'The special case of Norway in the 20th century: language conflict and language planning', in Bandle et al (eds.) 1635-1647.

Jespersen, Otto. 1905. *Growth and structure of the English language.* Leipzig: Teubner.

Jespersen, Otto. 1922. *Language. Its nature, development and origin*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Jones. Mari C. 2010. 'Channel Island English', in Schreier, Daniel, Peter Trudgill, Edgard W. Schneider & Jeffrey P. Williams (eds.), 35-56.

Jones, Morris. 1973. 'The present condition of the Welsh language', in: Stephens, Meic (ed). *The Welsh Language today*. Llanddysul: Gomer Press, 110- 126.

Jordan, Sabine. 1995. *Niederdeutsches im Lettischen: Untersuchunen zu den mittelniederdeutschen Lehnwörter im Lettischen*. Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte.

Kaiser, Georg A. & Lenka Scholze. 2009. 'Verbstellung im Sprachkontakt – das Obersorbische und Bündnerromanische im Kontakt mit dem Deutschen', in Scholze, Lenka & Björn Wiemer (eds.) *Von Zuständen, Dynamik und Veränderung bei Pygmäen und Giganten. Festschrift für Walter Breu zu seinem 60. Geburtstag.* Bochum: Brockmeyer, 305-330.

Kaufmann, Göz. 2011. 'Looking for order in chaos: standard convergence and divergence in Mennonite Low German', in Putnam (ed.), 189-230.

Kiefer, Ferenc. 2010. 'Areal-typological aspects of word-formation: the case of aktionsart-formation in German, Hungarian, Slavic, Baltic, Romani and Yiddish', in Rainer, Franz, Wolfgang Y. Dressler, Dieter Kastovsky & Hans Christian Luschützky (eds.) *Variation and change in morphology: Selected papers from the 13th International Morphology Meeting, Vienna 2008.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 129-148

Klemola, Juhani. 2013 'English as a contact language in the British Isles', in Schreier & Hundt (eds), 75-87.

Knipf-Komlósi, Elisabeth. 2006. 'Sprachliche Muster bei Sprachintelsprechern am Beispiel der Ungarndeutschen', in Berend, Nina & Elisabeth Knipf-Komlósi (eds.) 2006. *Sprachinselwelten – The world of language islands. Entwicklung und Beschreibung der deutschen Sprachinseln am Anfang des 21. Jahrhunderts – The developmental stages and the description of German languages islands at the beginning of the 21st century*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 39-56.

Koivulehto, Jorma. 2002. 'Contact with non-Germanic langauges II: Relations to the East', in Bandle, Braunmüller & Håkon Jahr (eds.), 583-594.

Kontzi, Reinhold. 1982. ‘Einleitung’, in Kontzi, Reinhold (ed.) *Substrate und Superstrate in den romanischen Sprachen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1-27.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria & Bernhard Wälchli. 2001. ‘The Circum-Baltic languages: An areal-typological approach’, in Dahl, Ósten & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.) *Circum-Baltic languages. Volume 2: Grammar and typology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 615-750.

Kortmann, Bernd. 1998. ‘Adverbial subordinators in the languages of Europe’, in van der Auwera, Johan with Dónall P, Ó Baoill (ed.), 457-561.

Kortmann, Bernd & Johan van der Auwera (eds.) 2011. *The languages and linguistics of Europe. A comprehensive guide*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Kühl, Karoline H. & Hjalmar P. Petersen. 2009. ‘Converging verbal phrases in related languages – A case study from Faro-Danish and Danish German language contact situations’, in Braunmüller & House (eds.), 101-124.

Lagman, Herbert. 1971. *Svensk-Estnisk Språkkontakt. Studier över estniskans inflytande på de estlandssvenska dialekterna.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Lagman, Svante, Stig Örjan Ohlsson & Viivika Voodla (eds.) 2002 *Svenska språkets historia i Östsjöområdet.* Tartu : Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

Lamiroy, Béatrice. 2011. ‘Degrés de grammaticalisation à travers les langues de même famille’, *Mémoires de la Société Linguistique de Paris. L’évolution grammaticale à travers les langues romanes*, 167-192.

Lass, Roger & Susan Wright. 1986. ‘Endogeny vs. contact: “Afrikaans influence” on South African English’, *English World-Wide* 7: 201-223.

Le Coultre, Jean-Jules. 1875. ‘De l’ordre des mots dans Crestien de Troyes’, in Ernst Ziel (ed.) *XIV. Programm des Vitzhumschen Gymnasiums, als Einladung zu dem 17. 18 und 19. März 1875 stattfindenden öffentlichen Examen und Redeactus*. Dresden : Teubner, 5-88.

Lenz, Alexandra N, Charlotte Gooskens & Siemon Reker (eds.) *Low Saxon dialects across border – Niedersächsische Dialekte über Grenze hinweg*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Lindell, Lenny & Kenth Thorbjörnsson-Djerf. 2008. *Ordbok över svensk romani. Resandefolkets språk och sånger. Inledning, grammatik och bearnetning av Gerd Carling*. Stockholm : Podium.

Lutz, Angelika. 2002. ‘When did English begin?’, in Fanego, Teresa, Belén Méndez-Naya & Elena Seoane (eds.) *Sounds, words, texts and change : Selected papers from 11 ICEHL, Santiago de Compostela, 7-11 September 2000*. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 145-171.

Makhudu, K. Dennis Papi. 2002. An introduction to Flaaitaal (or Tsotsitaal). In: Rajend Mesthrie (ed.), *Language in South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 398-406.

Manherz, Károly & Katalin Wild. 1987. *Zur Sprache und Volskultur der Ungarndeutschen.* Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.

Marchello-Nizia. 1995. *L'évolution du français. Ordre des mots, demonstratives, accent tonique*. Paris : Armand Collin.

Markey, Thomas L. 1969. *The verbs* varda *and* bliva *in Scandinavian, with special emphasis on Swedish.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Markey, Thomas L. 1982. Afrikaans: creole or non-creole? *Zeitschrift fur Dialektologie und Linguistik* 49. 169- 207.

Matisoff, James A. 1991. 'Sino-Tibetan linguistics: present state and future prospects', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 20: 469-504.

Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matras, Yaron & Peter Bakker (eds.). 2003. *The mixed language debate. Theoretical and empirical advances.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Matras, Yaron, April McMahon & Nigel Vincent (eds.). 2006. *Linguistic areas. Convergence in historical and typological perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Matras, Yaron & Jeannette Sakel. 2007. 'Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence', *Studies in Language* 31: 829-865.

McWhorter, John H. 2002. 'What happened to English?', *Diachronica* 19: 217-272.

McWhorter, John H. 2008. *Our magnificent bastard tongue*. *The untold story of English*. New York: Gotham Books.

Meister Ferré, Barbara. 1994. *Stability and change in the Pennsylvania German dialect of an Old Order Amish community in Lancaster County.* Stuttgard: Steiner.

Melchers, Gunnel & Peter Sundkvist. 2010. 'Orkney and Shetland', in Schreier, Daniel, Peter Trudgill, Edgard W. Schneider & Jeffrey P. Williams (eds.), 17-34.

Mesthrie, Rajend. 2002. 'Endogeny versus contact revisited: aspectual busy in South African English', *Language Sciences* 24: 345-358

Messner, Dieter. 1997. *Einführung in die Geschichte des französichen Wortschatzes*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Miller, D. Gary. 2012. *External influences on English. From its beginnings to the Renaissance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mitterand, Henri. 1968. *Les mots français.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Mossé, Fernand. 1952. *A handbook of Middle English.* Baltimore : Johns Hopkins Press.

Moulin, Claudine & Damaris Nübling (eds.). 2006. *Perspektiven einer linguistischen Luxemburgistik*. Heidelberg : Winter.

Munske, Horst Haider with Nils Århammer, Volkert F. Faltings, Jarich F. Hoekstra, Oebele Vries, Alastair G.H. Walker & Ommo Wilds (ed.) 2001. *Handbuch des Friesischen. Handbook of Frisian Studies*. Tübingen : Niemeyer.

Murelli, Adriano & Bernd Kortmann. 2011. 'Non-standard varieties in the areal typology of Europe', in Kortmann & van de Auwera (eds.), 525-544.

Ohlsson, Stig Örjan. 2004. 'Language contact in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries – the Kingdom of Sweden', in Bandle et al (eds.) 1361-1368.

O'Neil, W. 1978. 'The evolution of the Germanic inflectional systems: A study in the causes of language change', *Orbis* 28: 248-286.

Otheguy, Ricardo & Ana Celia Zentella. 2012. *Spanish in New York: Language Contact, Dialect Leveling, and Structural Contiguity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Östman, Jan-Ola. 2011. 'Language contact in the North of Europe', in Kortmann & van der Auwera (eds.), 359-380.

Pawischitz. Sabine. 2009. 'Deutsche Lehnwörter in der burgenlandkroatischen Ungangssprache', in Scholze & Wiemer (eds.), 331-346.

Pedersen, Karen Margrethe. 2000. 'German as first language and minority second language in Denmark', in Gabrielle Hogan-Brun (ed.) *National varieties of German outside Germany. A European perspective.* Oxford: Lang, 195-220.

Pedersen, Karen Margrethe. 2009. 'South Schleswig Danish – a border-regional minority language', in Lenz, Gooskens & Reker (eds.), 297-316.

Picoche, Jacqueline & Christiane Marchello-Nizia. 1994[3]. *Histoire de la langue française*. Paris: Nathan.

Polanska, Ineta. 2002. *Zum Einfluss des Lettischen auf das Deutsche im Baltikum*. Inaugural-Dissertation Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg.

Polomé, Edgar C. 1972. 'Germanic and the other Indo-European languages', in Frans van Coetsem & Herbert L. Kufner (eds.) *Toward a grammar of Proto-Germanic*. Tübingen : Niemeyer, 43-69.

Poplack, Shana. 2008. 'Quebec English', *Anglistik* 19: 189-200.

Putnam, Michael T. (ed.). 2011. *Studies on German-language islands*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Raidt, Edith H. 1983. *Einführung in Geschichte und Struktur des Afrikaans*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Rainsford, T.M. Céline Guillot, Alexei Lavrentiev & Sophie Prévost. 2012. 'La zone préverbale en ancien français: apport des corpus annotés', in Franck Neveu, Valelia Muni Toke, Peter Blumenthal, Thoamas Klingler, Pierluigui Ligas, Sophie Prévost et Sandra Teston-Bonnard (eds), *Congrès mondial de linguistique française,* 159-176 <http://www.shs-conferences.org/articles/shsconf/abs/2012/01/shsconf_cmlf12_000246/shsconf_cmlf12_000246.html>

Reershemius, Gertrud. 2007. 'Reste des Westjiddischen in niederdeutschen Sprachgebiet', in Fandrych, Chistian & Reinier Salverda (eds.), *Standard, variation und Sprachwandel in germanischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Narr, 241-264.

Reuter, Mikael. 2004 'Swedish in Finland in the 20th century', Bandle et al (eds.) 1647-1656.

Roca, Ana & John M. Lipski (eds.). 1993. *Spanish in the United States: Linguistic Contact and Diversity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ruth. King. 2000. *The Lexical Basis of Grammatical Borrowing: A Prince Edward Island French case study.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Scheler, Manfred. 1977. *Der englische Wortschatz*. Berlin: Schmidt.

Scholze, Lenka. 2008. *Das grammtische System der obersorbischen Umgangssprache im Sprachkontakt.* Bautzen: Sorbisches Institut.

Schreier, Daniel & Marianne Hundt (eds.) 2013. *English as a Contact Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schreier, Daniel, Peter Trudgill, Edgard W. Schneider & Jeffrey P. Williams (eds.) *The lesser-known varieties of English. An introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seip, Didrik Arup. 1931. 'Hvad norsk språk gav, og hvad det fikk i middelalderen', in *Norge og Europa i middelalderen.* Oslo: Ashehaug, 88-103.

Smith, Johannes J. 1952. *Theories about the Origin of Afrikaans*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Smits, Ton F.H. 2009. 'Prinzipien der Dialektresistenz – zur Bestimmung einer dialektalen Abbauhierarchie', in Lenz, Gooskens & Reker (eds.), 297-338.

Spence, N.C.W. 1984. ‘Channel Island French’, in Trudgill (ed.), 345-351.

Stenson, Nancy. 1993. ‘English influence on Irish: the last 100 years’, *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 2: 107-128.

Stolz, Thomas. 2006. ‘All or nothing’, in Matras, McMahon & Vincent (eds.), 32-50.

Talmy, Leonard. 1972. ‘Yiddish verb prefixes between Germanic and Slavic’, *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguisic Society* 231-250.

Thomason, Sandra A. & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact: creolization and genetic linguistics.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Townend, Matthew. 2012. ‘Contacts and conflicts: Latin, Norse and French’, Mugglestone, Lynda (ed.) *The Oxford history of English*. Updated edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 75-105.

Tristram, Hildegard L.C. 1999. *How Celtic is Standard English?* St Petersburg: Russian Academy of Sciences.

Tristram, Hildegard L.C. 2002. ‘Attrition of inflections in English and Welsh’, in Filppula, Klemola & Pitkänen (eds.), 111-149.

Trubetzkoy, Nicolair S. 1930. ‘Proposition 16’, *Actes du premier congrès international des linguistes à la Haye,due 10-15 avril 1928.* Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 17-18.

Trudgill, Peter (ed.) 1984. *Languages in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Bree, Cor & Arjen P. Versloot with Rolf H. Bremmer Jr. 2008. *Oorsprongen van het Stadsfries. With an extensive summary*. Ljouwert: Fryske Adademy.

Van Coetsem, Frans. 1988. *Loan phonology and the two transfer types in language contact.* Dordrecht: Foris.

van der Auwera, Johan. 1998a. ‘Phasal adverbials in the languages of Europe’, in van der Auwera, Johan with Dónall P, Ó Baoill (ed.), 25-145.

van der Auwera, Johan. 1998b. ‘Conclusion’, in van der Auwera, Johan with Dónall P, Ó Baoill (ed.), 813-836.

van der Auwera, Johan.2011. ‘Standard Average European’, in Kortmann & van der Auwera (eds.), 291-306.

van der Auwera, Johan & Inge Genee. 2002. 'English *do:* On the convergence of languages and linguists', *English Language and Linguistics* 6: 283-307.

van der Auwera, Johan, Ewa Schalley & Jan Nuyts. 2005. 'Epistemic possibility in a Slavonic parallel corpus. A pilot study', in Björn Hansen & Petr Karlík (eds.), *Modality in Slavonic Languages*. Munich: Otto Sagner, 201-217.

van der Auwera, Johan with Dónall P, Ó Baoill (ed.) 1998. *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Van Ness, Silke. 1990. *Changes in an obsolescing language: Pennsylvania German in West Virginia*. Tübingen: Narr.

Van Rensburg, M.C.J.. 1983. 'Nie-standaardvorme, variasiepatrone en Afrikaans uit de vorige eeu', in G.N. Claassen & M.C.J. van Rensburg (eds.), *Taalverskeidenheid: 'n Blik op die Spektrum van taalvariasie in Afrikaans*. Pretoria: Academica, 134-161.

Van Rensburg, Christo. 2012. *So Kry Ons Afrikaans.* Pretoria: Lapa.

Vennemann, Theo gen, Nierfeld. 2003. *Europa Vasconica – Europa Semitica,* Ed. by Patrizia Noel Aziz Hanna. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Vennemann, Theo gen, Nierfeld. 2012. *Germania Semitica,* Ed. by Patrizia Noel Aziz Hanna. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

v[on] Wartburg, W[alther]. 1971[10]. *Évolution et structure de la langue française*. Bern: Francke.

von Wartburg, Walther. 1967. *La fragmentationi linguistique de la Romania*. Paris: Klincksieck. [Translation of 1950. *Die Ausgliederung der romanischen Sprachräume*. Bern: Francke.]

Wälchli, Bernhard. 2011. 'The Circum-Baltic languages', in Kortmann & van der Auwera (eds.), 325-340.

Walker, Alistair H. 2001. 'Extent and position of North Frisian', in Munske (ed.) 263-284.

Walter, Henriette. 1994. *L'Aventure des langues en Occident. Leur origine, leur histoire, leur géographie.* Paris: Laffont.

Weerman, Fred. 2006. "It's the economy, stupid! Een vergelijkende blik op *men* en *man*", in Matthias Hüning, Ulrike Vogel, Ton van der Wouden and Arie Verhagen (eds), *Nederlands tussen Duits en Engels*. 19-47.Leiden: Stichting Neerlandistiek Leiden.

Wehr, Barbara. 2001. 'Ein west-atlantischer Sprachbund: Irish, Französisch, Portugiesisch', in Heiner Eichner, Peter-Arnold Mumm, Oswald Panagl & Eberhard Winkler (eds.) *Fremd und Eigen: Untersuchungen zu Grammatik und Wortschatz des Uralischen und Indogermanischen in memoriam Hartmut Katz*. Wien: Edition Praesens, 253-278.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1958a. ‘Yiddish and colonial German in Eastern Europe: the differential impact of Slavic’, *American contributions to the fourth international congress of Slavicists, Moscow, September1958*. Den Haag: Mouton, 369-421.

Weinreich, U. 1958b. ‘On the compatibility of genetic relationship and convergent development’, *Word* 14: 374-379.

Wessén, Elias. 1929. ‘Om det tyska inflytandet på svenskt språk under medeltiden’, *Nordisk tidskrift för vetenskap, konst och industri utgiven af Letterstedtska föreningen* 5: 265-280.

Wexler, Paul. 2002. *Two-tiered relexification in Yiddish*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

White, David L. 2002. ‘Explaining the innovations of Middle English : What, where and why’, in Filppula, Klemola & Pitkänen (eds.), 153-174.

Wiik, Kalevi. 1997. ‘The Uralic and Finno-Ugric phonetic substratum in Proto-Germanic’, *Linguistica Uralica* 33: 258-280.

Wogan-Browne, Jocelyn with Carolyn Collette, Maryanne Kowalski, Linne Mooney, Ann Putter & David Trotter (ed.) 2009. *Language and culture in Medieval Britain: the French of England c. 1100 - c. 1500*. Woodbridge: York Medieval Press & Boydell Press.

Worren, Dagfinn. 2002. ‘Interscandinavian language contact II: Linguistic influence’, in Bandle, Braunmüller & Håkon Jahr (eds.), 2032-2048.

View publication stats